

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 12, and 13 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

In the specification, the paragraphs [0019], [0020], (0022), and [0024] have been amended to correct minor formalities. Claim 12 has also been amended to correct a minor formality.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner states that the specification does not teach a stop on the carousel and the drawings do not show a stop.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 13 to remove the references to a stop.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dodd et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,809,263. (Examiner's Action, page 2).

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to include the wording between the object and the axis of rotation in reference to the location of the mating between the latch reciprocal with the latching hub. These amendments do not add new matter as Figures 1-4 clearly show the latch reciprocal mating with the latching hub between the object and the axis of rotation.

Dodd discloses two circular plates (24, 26) between which an article (12) is received. The article (12) has a pair of flanges (32, 34) which are held in place by a pair of detents (43). The detents (43) do not mate with the flanges (32, 34) between the article (12) and the axis of rotation (42) (Dodd, Figure 2A). Therefore, Dodd does not disclose mating a latch reciprocal with a latching hub between an object and an axis of rotation.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, include the wording that a latch reciprocal mates with a latching hub between an object and an axis of rotation. Since Dodd does not disclose flanges (32, 34) mating with detents (43) between article (12) and axis of rotation (42), Dodd does not disclose this limitation of Applicant's independent claims 1 and 8.

Dodd additionally discloses that the two circular plates (24, 26) are a portion of a carrier (10). The two circular plates (24, 26) are not mounted with the carrier (10). Therefore, Dodd does not disclose a latching hub mounted within a rotatable carousel.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 13 includes the wording that a latching hub is mounted within a rotatable carousel. Since Dodd does not disclose the two circular plates (24, 26) mounted with carrier (10), Dodd does not disclose this limitation of Applicant's independent claim 13.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dodd in view of Teranishi, U.S. Patent No. 4,844,679. (Examiner's Action, page 2).

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 13 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Robin P. Yergenson

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 12/18/03
(719) 260-7900